

## State Water Resources Control Board

### UST CASE CLOSURE SUMMARY

#### Agency Information

Agency Name: Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (Los Angeles Water Board)	Address: 320 West 4 <sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 200 Los Angeles, CA 90013
Agency Caseworker: Mr. Ahmad J. Lamaa	Case No.: R-23108

#### Case Information

USTCF Claim No.: 12609	Global ID: T0603705383
Site Name: Sanesco #11	Site Address: 8510 East Rosecrans Avenue Paramount, CA 90723 (Site)
Responsible Party: Sanesco Oil Company Attention: Ms. Katie Kolpas	Address: 17311 South Main Street Gardena, CA 90248
USTCF Expenditures to Date: \$926,388	Number of Years Case Open: 18

**URL:** [http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/profile\\_report.asp?global\\_id=T0603705383](http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/profile_report.asp?global_id=T0603705383)

#### Summary

**This case has been proposed for closure by the State Water Resources Control Board at the request of the Los Angeles Water Board, which concurs with closure.**

The Low-Threat Underground Storage Tank Case Closure Policy (Policy) contains general and media-specific criteria, and cases that meet those criteria are appropriate for closure pursuant to the Policy. This case meets all of the required criteria of the Policy.

The Site is currently operated as an active fueling facility. The release at the Site was discovered when three gasoline underground storage tanks were removed and replaced in October 1996. Soil vapor extraction (SVE) and air sparging (AS) were conducted between March 2003 and January 2005, removing 8,900 pounds of petroleum constituents. The SVE/AS system was removed due to consistently low vapor concentrations in the influent vapor stream.

The average depth to groundwater is 36 feet below ground surface. The contaminant plume that exceeds water quality objectives (WQOs) is less than 1,000 feet in length and is stable or decreasing. There are no existing water supply wells or surface water bodies identified within 1,000 feet of the Site. Remaining petroleum constituents are limited, stable, and decreasing.

Additional assessment would be unnecessary and will not likely change the conceptual model. Any remaining petroleum constituents do not pose significant risk to human health, safety, or the environment under current conditions.

### Rationale for Closure under the Policy

- General Criteria – Site **MEETS ALL EIGHT GENERAL CRITERIA** under the Policy.
- Groundwater Media-Specific Criteria – Site meets the criteria in **Class 4**. The contaminant plume that exceeds WQOs is less than 1,000 feet in length. There is no free product. The nearest existing water supply well or surface water body is greater than 1,000 feet from the defined plume boundary. The dissolved concentration of benzene is less than 1,000 micrograms per liter ( $\mu\text{g/L}$ ), and the dissolved concentration of methyl tert-butyl ether is less than 1,000  $\mu\text{g/L}$ .
- Petroleum Vapor Intrusion to Indoor Air – Site meets the **EXCEPTION** for vapor intrusion to indoor air. Exposure to petroleum vapors associated with historical fuel system releases are comparatively insignificant relative to exposures from small surface spills and fugitive vapor releases that typically occur at active fueling facilities.
- Direct Contact and Outdoor Air Exposure – Site meets **Criteria 3 (a)**. Maximum concentrations of petroleum constituents in soil from confirmation soil samples are less than or equal to those listed in Table 1 of the Policy.

There are no soil samples results in the case record for naphthalene. However, the relative concentration of naphthalene in soil can be conservatively estimated using the published relative concentrations of naphthalene and benzene in gasoline. Taken from Potter and Simmons (1998), gasoline mixtures contain approximately 2% benzene and 0.25% naphthalene. Therefore, benzene concentrations can be used as a surrogate for naphthalene concentrations with a safety factor of eight. Benzene concentrations from the Site are below the naphthalene thresholds in Table 1 of the Policy. Therefore, estimated naphthalene concentrations meet the thresholds in Table 1 and the Policy criteria for direct contact with a safety factor of eight. It is highly unlikely that naphthalene concentrations in the soil, if any, exceed the threshold.

### Recommendation for Closure

The corrective action performed at this Site ensures the protection of human health, safety, the environment and is consistent with chapter 6.7 of the Health and Safety Code and implementing regulations, applicable state policies for water quality control and the applicable water quality control plan, and case closure is recommended.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
George Lockwood, PE No. 59556  
Senior Water Resource Control Engineer

09/1/2015  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

